

SCRIPTURE

THE QUARTERLY OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

VOL. V. No. 3

JULY 1952

EDITORIAL

Lectures. The course of Biblical lectures which has been running at the Newman Association, 31 Portman Square, London, W.1, for the past three years, will start again in October next with *Introduction to Bible Study*. Though numbers have not been large they have been fairly constant and there has been sustained interest on the part of the students. We hope that we may now say that the course is an established part of the programme at the Newman Centre, and that the numbers will gradually grow. Apart from the three-year cycle of lectures, it is planned also to have eventually other Biblical lectures of a more specialized character for the benefit of those who desire to continue their studies further.

A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. The editorial work on this may now be said to be practically complete. There is, however, a vast amount of work to be done by the printers and they are pushing on with their colossal task as fast as is humanly possible. They expect to publish at the end of this year.

Rome Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study. As our readers already know, the President for 1952 of this Society is our own Chairman, Monsignor Barton, Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. The members of the Society are of course predominantly non-Catholic and the meetings have nearly always been held in Great Britain. It was a happy thought to invite the Society to meet this year in Rome at the Biblical Institute during Holy Week, under the Presidency of Mgr Barton. It should be here recorded that shortly before the meeting took place, Mgr Barton was made a Domestic Prelate of His Holiness the Pope. We offer him our respectful congratulations. Father Dyson, S.J., professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome made himself responsible for most of the arrangements for the meeting, and sincere thanks are due to him for his care and hard work. The members were comfortably accommodated in various places in the city, and the sessions

took place at the Biblical Institute. Many papers were read and a large audience attended, including the heads of colleges and other dignitaries. The British Minister to the Holy See, Sir Walter Roberts, came to one of the sessions and also spoke. There were on the average, about fifty to eighty present at each session. Everything possible was done to make the meeting as memorable as possible.

The treasures of the Vatican Library were thrown open and the members were shown round by Father van Lantscoot, a Consultor of the Biblical Commission. Father Dyson took members round the Vatican Museum. Many other visits and excursions were also arranged.

The high point of the meeting was reached with the Papal Audience which took place on the morning of Good Friday, 11th April, in the Throne Room. His Holiness addressed them for a few minutes and then imparted the Apostolic Benediction. Here is the text of His discourse:—

When We come to expressing a word of welcome and encouragement to such an elect group of Scripture scholars, Our memory goes back at once to what Our saintly Predecessor, Damasus, well on to sixteen centuries ago, wrote to the learned St Jerome. 'I do not believe there can be a subject more worthy of conversation between us than the Scriptures' (Ep. XXXV—Migne, P.L., Vol. XXII, col. 451). Nothing could be truer, when one reflects that from the *IN PRINCIPIO* of Genesis to the *VENI, DOMINE JESU* of the Apocalypse the Holy Scriptures contain the word of God. What a precious vein of untold riches is opened up by almost any of its sentences! But We must be brief. 'Pleasant is a meadow', wrote Chrysostom, 'a garden is fair; but still more pleasant is the study of Holy Scripture. In the meadow we find flowers, but they quickly fade; in Holy Scripture we hear words that have the power of immortal life. In the meadow the zephyrs blow; in the Scripture the Holy Spirit breathes . . . In the meadow there is the passing pleasure of the senses; the reading of Scripture procures advantages of lasting value to the soul' (Migne P. G., Vol. LII, col. 395-96).

But those spiritual advantages will be genuine and solid in proportion to one's certain and accurate knowledge of what the sacred author has said. Hence the ever-present need of devoted scholars, who in their tireless research to unfold the exact meaning of the divine word will be equipped to make wise and judicious use of the vast apparatus of biblical philology, geography, history, archæology, textual criticism and the natural sciences, so that Eternal Truth in all its splendour may shine forth to enlighten and warm the minds and hearts of men.

It is gratifying to note from a perusal of your programme, that such scholars are not lacking to-day in the various parts of the world, and We fondly hope that many others, who have been blessed by

God with large measure of natural talent, of piety and learning, will follow you in the same praiseworthy apostolate.

You are closing your study-week on a day hallowed by the memory of the glorious triumph of Him, whose sacred person hovers over all the pages of the Bible. Its different parts, like so many converging rays, focus their light on His radiant figure, the promised, the long-expected One, who at the appointed time came to fulfil the hopes and aspirations of all mankind for life eternal. His proffered gift was peace—peace with God, the Father of all. This, too, is the burden of Our daily prayer, the aim of all the toil and sufferings of the Church. When all men have sought and found peace with God, they will have come a long way to enjoy the blessings of a true peace between nations.

May the peace and joy of the risen Christ fill your own hearts and the hearts of those who are near and dear to you.

After that, His Holiness walked round speaking to each in turn. He asked them about their work and showed great interest in their activities.

A photograph was taken at the end of the audience and in this the place of honour beside His Holiness appears to be taken, at the Pope's express wish, by the small daughter of one of the professors attending the meeting.

It would not be too much to say that the whole visit to Rome made a profound impression on those taking part, and the significance of the meeting, the first of its kind to be held there, did not escape the participants.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

VALUE OF THE SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE

IN the January number of *SCRIPTURE*, Father C. Lattey, S.J., gave a brief commentary on the questions and answers issued by the Biblical Commission about the book of Isaiah together with a few notes on some of the more relevant problems of the book, such as the Servant songs and the Emmanuel prophecy. As regards the fourth and fifth answers, Father Lattey rightly says that 'plurality of authors is not absolutely excluded' (p. 3).

Now the question arises: Supposing we are able one day to demonstrate conclusively that the book of Isaiah has been written by two or more authors, how are we to account for the unanimous tradition which

ever since the second century B.C. has recognized the prophet Isaiah as the author of the whole book? In other words: How shall we reconcile the established data of literary criticism with the Jewish and Christian tradition of unity of authorship?

E. J. Kissane in his commentary on the book of Isaiah (Vol. I, 1941; Vol. II, 1943) has tried to reconcile the conflicting data—internal evidence and external evidence—by distinguishing between author and editor. Isaiah, he says, is the author of chapters i-xxxv, which were collected and arranged in their present order by an editor who lived in the exile, who is also responsible for the insertion of chapters xxxvi-xxxix and for some slight alterations (Vol. I, pp. 26-37). Chapters xl-lxvi, which modern criticism ascribes to an unknown author conventionally called Deutero-Isaiah or Second-Isaiah, were written by the same compiler or editor who collected his material from the oral tradition which preserved, fresh and intact, Isaiah's teaching. So that these chapters, though written one century and a half after the death of the great prophet, really represent the doctrine of Isaiah and must be regarded as his work in the same way as the Letter to the Hebrews must be considered as the work of St Paul, though perhaps written by a different person. The ideas are Isaiah's, or Paul's, but the literary form is the work of another (Vol. II, pp. 56-61).

The comparison between the supposed composition of Is. xl-lxvi and the Epistle to the Hebrews reveals the weak point and the improbability of Kissane's theory. Paul must be considered as the author of *Hebrews* because the letter, if not actually written by him, was certainly conceived by him, written under his direction and finally approved by him. The case is different with Is. xl-lxvi. According to Kissane's theory these chapters contain Isaiah's teaching but were neither written under his direction nor with his approval. Isaiah, therefore, can hardly be considered to be the author of chapters xl-lxvi, and one fails to see how this theory can claim to have reconciled the internal evidence with Jewish tradition.

A similar theory has recently been proposed by P. Auvray and J. Steinmann in their joint translation of the book of Isaiah (*La Bible de Jérusalem*, 1951). The two translators suppose that there existed, in the time of Isaiah, and long after, a group of the prophet's admirers, imbued with his teaching and animated by his spirit, a group of followers that may be called Isaiah's disciples. To those of his disciples who lived in the exile are to be attributed chapters xl-lxvi and some chapters of the first part (pp. 12-15).

It is difficult to see how the traditional view of Isaian authorship can be maintained in these theories. Nobody can be said to be the author of a book because it simply expresses his ideas and teaching. If Isaiah is to be held the author of the book which bears his name, something

more than a mere affinity between his teaching and the doctrine of the book is required. But before establishing this closer affinity between Isaiah and his book, it is absolutely necessary to examine the grounds upon which tradition is based.

The earliest Jewish tradition is represented by the author of Ecclesiasticus, by the LXX version and by the New Testament writers. The author of Ecclesiasticus writes of the prophet Isaiah: 'With a great spirit he saw the things that are to come to pass at last, and comforted the mourners in Sion. He showed what should come to pass for ever, and secret things before they came' (48, 27f). As this passage contains clear references to Isaiah Part II (cf. xl, 1; xli, 22f; li, 12; lii, 9), it is generally inferred that the author of Ecclesiasticus, who wrote about 190 B.C., expressly attributed chapters xl—lxvi to Isaiah. Thus R. Cornely writes: 'It is commonly agreed that at the time of Ben Sira the second part of Isaiah was attributed to Isaiah' (*Historica et Critica Introductio in U. T. libros*, Vol. II, 2, p. 345; see also Cornely-Merk, *Compendium Introductionis in S. Scripturae libros*, 1929, p. 547). The same view is held by J. Goettsberger (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1928, p. 291), Höpfl-Müller-Metzinger (*Introductio in V. T.*, 1946, p. 422) and by many others. The same conclusion, namely that the second part of the book of Isaiah was attributed to Isaiah during the second century B.C., is drawn from the fact that the Septuagint Greek version, which was very probably made in the beginning of the second century, reads the book in its present form. Two centuries later, the New Testament writers quote the second part of the book attributing it expressly to Isaiah, thus Is. xl, 3=Matt. iii, 3; Mark i, 3; Luke iii, 4; John i, 23; Is. xliii, 1=4-Matt. xii, 17; Is. liii, 1, 4, 7=John xii, 38; Matt. viii, 17; Acts viii, 28; etc.

It is very precarious, however, to infer from all these references and quotations that the author of Ecclesiasticus, the translator of Isaiah and the New Testament writers expressly attributed the second part of the book to Isaiah. The only legitimate conclusion is that all those passages are taken from a book or a collection of oracles that was expressly attributed to Isaiah. It is the whole collection, not a part of it, that is expressly attributed to Isaiah. The division of the book of Isaiah into two distinct parts is the result of modern criticism, but was unknown to early readers and editors. At the time of Christ and two centuries earlier the oracles of Isaiah, whether they were written on one or more scrolls, were considered as one literary unit or one work containing the present sixty-six chapters. Therefore from whatever part or chapter a quotation is made, its value as a witness for the origin of a book cannot be restricted to that part or chapter alone, but must be extended to the whole book or collection. It follows that such words as: 'For this is he that was spoken of by Isaías the prophet saying: A voice of one . . .'

(Matt. iii, 3 ; Mark i, 3 ; Luke iii, 4 quoting Is. xl, 3) can only mean that the quotation is taken from a collection of oracles attributed to Isaiah, and consequently that the *whole* collection or book is expressly recognized as the work of Isaiah.

If this is the value of the scriptural evidence in favour of the Isaian origin of the whole book, it will be admitted that both the author of Ecclesiasticus and the New Testament writers recognize Isaiah as the sole author of the whole book irrespective of our way of dividing it into parts. This recognition must, of course, be taken in a general sense and does not necessarily imply that Isaiah has written every single sentence ; it is not, therefore, inconsistent with the presence, in the book of Isaiah, of additional or editorial matter which, however, does not affect the general authorship of the book. As in the case of the Pentateuch the Biblical Commission has declared that the Mosaic authorship must be understood in the sense that Moses is the author of at least the substance of the Pentateuch (26th June 1906, question 4, and the letter of the Biblical Commission to Cardinal Suhard in A.A.S., 1948, 45-8), in the same way the Isaian authorship of the book of Isaiah must not necessarily be extended to every single sentence or even chapter. In course of time some slight alterations may have been made, some passages may have been adapted to the changed conditions of the people, whole sections may have been expanded or recast. If these changes and additions do not affect the substance of the book, Isaiah will still be regarded as the author of the latest, revised and enlarged, edition of his work as much as of the original one. Consequently, if a quotation is to be made from the additional or editorial matter, it has to be made under the name of Isaiah, the only recognized author of the book.

In order to realize how changes and additions can be made without affecting the general authorship of a book, one must try to visualize the manner in which books, especially the prophetic books, were produced. Books were written on strips of leather or papyrus of different sizes. It is not probable that the larger books of the Old Testament were written on a single strip or scroll. It is more likely that the prophets wrote down their discourses in parts, as occasion arose. If the Greek writers and scribes found it convenient to divide their works into any number of scrolls of moderate size, there is every reason to believe that the Hebrew writers of an earlier age, when the art of book-making was less developed, adopted the same method of dividing their works into a number of scrolls of smaller size. Therefore, what we now call the book of Isaiah was originally a loose collection or a bundle of smaller scrolls of a more or less uniform size, preserved in a chest or jar. There is ample evidence that the book of Jeremiah was written in this manner, partly by the prophet himself and partly by his scribe Baruch. A book written in this way was, naturally, more liable to editorial manipulation. The

several scrolls could be easily misplaced, others could be re-written and new ones could be added developing some of the fundamental doctrines of the original author. The following is only a tentative reconstruction of the gradual formation of the book of Isaiah. Chapters i to v and vii to xii form two separate collections of discourses in two separate scrolls with chapter vi transposed from the beginning of the first collection on account, perhaps, of the chronological sequence. Chapters xiii to xxiii, containing the prophecies against the nations, formed originally another collection and a separate scroll. Chapters xxiv to xxvii, describing the world-judgment, formed another unit or scroll. Chapters xxviii to xxxiii are a collection of poems which may be called the 'Woe collection' as each poem or discourse commences with the exclamation 'Woe!' The historical appendix 36-39 was certainly added later to the original collection of Isaiah scrolls. In the second part of the book we move on a more slippery ground. Very probably Isaiah had predicted not only the exile, but also the deliverance of the people, the restoration of Sion and the beginning of a new era which, in the prophet's perspective, merged in the Messianic era. Isaiah's prediction of the exile was fulfilled, and this fulfilment was a sure guarantee that the prediction of the deliverance will likewise be fulfilled. An unknown prophet of the exile may have developed this latter point, namely the certainty of the deliverance, describing it with new colours and making it to fit in God's plan of Israel's election and mission. Chapters xl-lxvi are, therefore, an expansion of Isaiah's original predictions of restoration and, as such, must be regarded as Isaiah's own work. This elaboration of Isaian matter accounts for a certain affinity of language and ideas between the two parts of the book, as well as for the omission of a new title at the beginning of the second part.

All this reconstruction of the composition of the book of Isaiah is, of course, highly hypothetical, but it affords, I dare hope, a satisfactory explanation of the peculiarities of the second part of Isaiah and a happy reconciliation of tradition with the established data of literary criticism.

P. P. SAYDON.

Royal University, Malta.

MOSES AND THE PENTATEUCH

A NEW APPROACH TO AN OLD PROBLEM

MANy parts of the 'Bible de Jérusalem' have already appeared, but after the publication of *le Deuteronomie*¹ and *le Lévitique*,² the advent of *la Genèse*³ was awaited with special interest. This was due not only to the importance of its subject matter—besides an introduction to the book of Genesis, it was to contain one to the Pentateuch as a whole—but also because the undertaking was entrusted to Père de Vaux, O.P., the capable director of the 'École Biblique'. Could the delicate task of giving a good, original and prudent answer to the many problems connected with the Pentateuch in general, and with Genesis in particular, have been placed in more competent hands? He is already known to readers of *SCRIPTURE* by his translation of 'The Books of Kings'.⁴ Some may be acquainted with his articles about 'The Hebrew Patriarchs and recent Discoveries'.⁵ Those who passed some time at the 'École Biblique' are not surprised that Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., of the University of Manchester, in his book *From Joseph to Joshua*⁶ acknowledged his great esteem for the sober judgment of Fr de Vaux. His experience in, and his knowledge of archæology, especially of Palestine and the Middle East, provides him with the additional qualities necessary for this charge. The way in which he has acquitted himself of this task, with special reference to the problem of Moses and the Pentateuch prompts me to entitle this article 'A New Approach to an Old Problem'. The importance of this particular question is sufficient justification for devoting a special article to it.

A few preliminary remarks about the edition would not be out of place. Most readers will already be acquainted with the external form of the 'Bible de Jérusalem'. Every book has to be revised by two scholars. One treating it from an exegetical point of view and the other paying attention to the style of the work. It is for this reason we find on page 4 the names of Abbé Robert, P.S.S., professor at the Institut Catholique

¹ *Le Deuteronomie*, H. Cazelles, P.S.S., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1950. See especially 'La composition du livre' (13-16); cf. *SCRIPTURE*, 1951, IV, 301, the view of Fr C. Lattey, S.J.; cf. also Mgr M. J. T. Barton, *Clergy Review*, 1952, 221-23. The latter displays a different attitude.

² *Le Lévitique*, H. Cazelles, P.S.S., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1950. See especially 'La date' (15).

³ *La Genèse*, R. de Vaux, O.P., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1951.

⁴ *Les Livres des Rois*, R. de Vaux, O.P., Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1949. See *SCRIPTURE*, 1950, IV, 215-16.

⁵ 'Les Patriarches Hébreux et les découvertes modernes', *Revue Biblique* 1946, 321-48; 1948, 321-47; 1949, 5-36. To mention only articles closely connected with our subject.

⁶ Oxford University Press, London, 1950. See *SCRIPTURE*, 1951, IV, 316-18.

at Paris and M. Marrou, professor at the Sorbonne. The author must take into account any suggestions offered by these two scholars. Further revisions may follow, a sign that the publication is taken as seriously as possible.

This procedure is carried out before the official *imprimatur* is given by ecclesiastical authority, and the *nihil obstat* of the Order or Congregation if the author is a religious. The *imprimatur* to *La Genèse* by Fr de Vaux, is given at Paris where the book was printed, and the *nihil obstat* at Jerusalem on 14th June 1951 by Frs Vincent and Couroyer, and at Rome by Fr Ceuppens on 15th August of the same year. On behalf of the Order, the Vicar General, Fr Gomez, gave permission on 18th October for the book to be printed. From all this it can be seen that more than usual attention was paid to the orthodoxy of the book.

The book opens on page 7 with a general introduction (18 pages) to the Pentateuch. Information is given about its name, contents and history of Pentateuchal criticism, forming as it were, a *status quaestionis*. The author then gives us his own views under the heading of the composition of the Pentateuch, the characteristics of the different traditions (not documents!) the dates and environments of their origin, and Moses and the Pentateuch. The introduction is brought to a close with two pages of special interest about the meaning of the Pentateuch. The next thirteen pages are devoted to a special introduction to Genesis. They treat of the composition of Genesis (in detail as far as possible), the plan and purpose of the book, its doctrine, Genesis and history, its place in the life of the Church, and finally a few words about the text and versions. After these short and clearly arranged introductions, we come to the actual text. It covers 181 pages and has about 600 notes. These latter vary from explanatory notes, psychological remarks, e.g., about how the storytellers aimed at holding the attention of their listeners and readers, to mere references to parallel passages.

The main question confronting Fr de Vaux was the problem of the literary composition of the Pentateuch. There are two ways of dealing with this problem. The first is by means of the external evidence. 'What does tradition tell us?' The second way is by making use of the internal evidence: the study of the texts, style, ideas and vocabulary of the different passages. Thus we are often able to distinguish literary works on merely internal grounds, e.g., a work of Dickens from one written by Thackeray. Tradition supplies us with the first certain witness of the existence of the whole Pentateuch in the preface to the book of Ecclesiasticus (about 132 B.C.)⁷, but no reference is made to the author. From the beginning of our Christian era, however, we have evidence to show that the composition of the whole Pentateuch was attributed by the Jews to Moses. Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament are our

⁷ See de Vaux, o. 1, 7.

witnesses. With great care Fr de Vaux classifies the texts of the New Testament where Moses is mentioned; 'the law of Moses'; 'Moses is read'; 'Moses said'; 'Moses wrote'. Special reference is made to John v, 45-47, in which Christ invoked the testimony of Moses against His adversaries, 'for he wrote about me'. It was not until the end of the Middle Ages that any serious doubt was brought to bear on this Jewish tradition to which Christ and His Apostles had acceded.⁸

It was due to the study of texts from a literary point of view, beginning in the sixteenth century, that serious doubts arose about the possibility of one author having written the whole Pentateuch. At first writers upheld the authorship of Moses, arguing that he had made use of old documents, and that later additions had been made to the work. As a result, attention was drawn to the composite character of the book. This trend of thought continued until finally the critics, paying no attention to the external evidence of tradition, but basing their arguments on the text itself, put forward the theory that the Pentateuch had been composed from four main documents. These were indicated by the letters P (Priestly code), E (Elohist), J (Jahvist), and D (Deuteronomy). Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Wellhausen, making use of the results of literary criticism, deduced the following conclusions: The whole Pentateuch was composed of four documents, J, E, D, and P. He gave what he considered definite dates at which the different documents were written. J and E were the oldest. J was written in Judah in the ninth century, E a little later in Israel. After the destruction of the Northern Kingdom, the two documents were joined together (J E), and Deuteronomy, which was connected with the reform of Josias, was added after his reign (J E D). After the exile, the Priestly code, laws as well as narratives, attributed to the time of the captivity or after, was incorporated in J E D and formed the scheme and frame of the whole compilation. Wellhausen applied the same theory to the book of Josue, as he thought it to be of the same structure. Hence he spoke of the Hexateuch.

It is obvious that, if this theory is true, the documents and composition of the Pentateuch had nothing to do with Moses, whether we place him in the fifteenth or thirteenth century and the value of the Jewish-Christian tradition from the beginning of our era, is reduced to nil. What made the matter so dangerous was that these documents did not go back to the facts they narrated. A gap of several centuries existed between them. They were consequently represented as projecting into the past the religious, social and politico-geographical circumstances of the time in which they were written. What had started as pure literary criticism was now used as a means to bolster up a false theory. This theory, which took no account of the supernatural, tried to explain the

⁸ See de Vaux, *o.* 1, 9.

Jewish religion as having naturally evolved from animism to monotheism, a hypothesis much in vogue at that time. It is not surprising that in these circumstances the Pontifical Biblical Commission thought it necessary to warn Catholic exegetes against this documentary theory, and to ask them to maintain the substantial Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch, recognizing at the same time the possibility of Moses having used oral traditions and written documents of an earlier age, and admitting later modifications and additions. Thus Fr de Vaux summarizes the answers of the Biblical Commission of 27th June 1906. 'The composite character of the book was acknowledged and the authorship of Moses, impossible in the light of the documentary theory as explained by Wellhausen, was, of course, maintained. A denial of this substantial authenticity in these circumstances was tantamount to depriving the narratives of every historical value.

In the meantime the critics, having come to accept the documentary theory as the classical explanation, rigorously following their own criteria, proceeded to split the four main documents into further pieces. These numerous sections they attributed to several other sources and to the work of different editors. Thus Fr de Vaux concludes 'it seems that this theory votes itself out of existence'.

Soon the critics were forced to water down their theory and thanks to the developments in archaeology and in the history of the civilizations around Israel, in the last twenty years a reaction has set in. Proofs have been brought forward which establish the existence of writing and literary activity of a much earlier date than was thought possible before. Extra-biblical documents containing many parallels to the institutions and laws mentioned in the Pentateuch have been discovered, and these documents are of much earlier dates than the times assigned to the biblical sources. Finally, it appeared that many of the narratives of the Pentateuch have a different and older background than that attributed to them by the documentary theory. As a result, the gap of several centuries which was supposed to exist between the facts and the written documents began to disappear, and the evolutionistic construction of the Jewish religion which Wellhausen had linked up with the documentary theory, showed signs of breaking down.

At the same time a reaction arose against the unnecessary multiplication of sources and editorial additions, the result of an exaggerated literary criticism. It was especially in Scandinavia that the oral tradition, rather than the final composition of the books, became the focal point of interest among scripture scholars. Admittedly certain texts could have been written down very early but it was the oral tradition, handed down in different circles and in different places, that they stressed as the more important factor. Hence these traditions, although faithful as far as the substance was concerned, differed according to the background

in which they were handed down. It therefore does not matter so much that the redaction of the Pentateuch is of a later date, as the oral tradition bridges the gap between the documents and the facts related in the Pentateuch.

As a conclusion to this section of the introduction dealing with the history of literary criticism, Fr de Vaux agrees that it is very difficult to give the actual state of the question. No longer is there any common opinion among the exegetes. Due to these reactions, the documentary theory has indeed received a serious blow and at the moment there is no new theory of such imposing character to take its place. Fr de Vaux concludes that to-day the trend is to take 'a less bookish solution and one which is more according to living realities'. In the light of this reaction perhaps we may quote the questions answered by the late Fr Voste, O.P., the Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, in his letter to Cardinal Suhard on 16th January 1948. In this letter, says Fr de Vaux, the Secretary of the Biblical Commission admitted the existence of sources and a progressive growth of the Mosaic laws and historical narratives due to the social and religious circumstances of later times, and invited the Catholic exegetes to study these problems without prejudice.

Under the guidance of Fr de Vaux, we thus put before our readers the actual state of the problem, considering it both in a general way and also from the point of view of the Church.⁹ The possibility of putting forward new solutions to old problems is due, in great part, to the encyclical of our present Holy Father the Pope, 'Divino afflante Spiritu' published in 1943. A passage of this encyclical quoted in the letter to Cardinal Suhard, certainly gives to the faithful sons of the Church to whom is committed the privileged but difficult task of studying the Sacred Books, the courage to tackle again and again old and still unsolved problems. The reader will not mind my quoting this passage. 'But this state of things is no reason why the Catholic commentator, inspired by an active and ardent love of his subject and sincerely devoted to Holy Mother Church, should in any way be deterred from grappling again and again with these difficult problems, hitherto unsolved, not only that he may refute the objections of the adversaries, but also may attempt to find a satisfactory solution, which will be in full accord with the doctrine of the Church, in particular with the traditional teaching regarding the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, and which will at the same time satisfy the indubitable conclusions of profane sciences. Let all the other sons of the Church bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute labourers

⁹ See de Vaux, O. 1, 11—13. The very nature of this article urged me to follow closely the exposition of Fr de Vaux. I emphasized the existing gap of several centuries and added the religious aspect of Wellhausen's theory, placing at the same time the decision and the letter of the Biblical Commission in their historical and psychological background.

in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected.¹⁰

Fr de Vaux¹¹ first considers what we called the internal evidence. The composite character of the Pentateuch cannot be denied. Proofs are the numerous 'duplicates, repetitions and discordances'. Putting aside as insufficient the reasons brought forward to deny these phenomena, he quotes a number of examples taken specially from the book of Genesis. Having studied these examples attentively, we must accept that, in spite of their similarity in substance, there are differences in style, vocabulary, in the manner of representing God and His relations with men, or in other words, a difference in literary form and mentality. Arguing from the special characteristics thus discovered, we are forced to accept four main-lines running through the whole Pentateuch, and Fr de Vaux specifies J E and P in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers and D in Deuteronomy. Because of its literary character and mentality he connects Deuteronomy with the books Josue, Judges, Samuel and Kings, in all of which the influence of D continues. In reference to its subject matter, the book is closely connected with the work and history of Moses, and therefore it was added to the Tetrateuch (four books) in place of the original conclusion, the death of Moses. We find traces of this conclusion in Deuteronomy xxiv. For Fr de Vaux, however, these four main-lines do not mean written documents which came into being between the ninth and fifth century without any real connection with the past. In accepting proximate dates of their essential composition—he is not as definite on this point as Wellhausen was in his time—J since the reign of Solomon, E a bit later, P during the exile and after the return and D at the end of the seventh century, he affirms that they had already had a long history before these dates. By calling these main-lines 'traditions' he sides with the reaction of the Scandinavian scholars mentioned previously. This is not just a way of avoiding the gap between the facts and the time that J, E, D and P were written down—the gap, in fact, disappears—but it is the only way of explaining how these main-lines in the Pentateuch, identical in their substance, have characteristic differences, and at the same time, presuppose a situation which is not the one of their time of composition, but of the time about which they claim to speak. They go back to oral and written traditions and their differences come from the fact that the same old tradition was handed down in different circles and in different places. Fr de Vaux then agrees that J is a tradition formed in Juda, that E probably comes from the Northern

¹⁰ Encyclical Letter of our Holy Father Pope Pius XII, on the most opportune way to promote Biblical Studies, *Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana*, 1943, 22.

¹¹ For the second part of this article see de Vaux, *o. l.*, 13, 14, 17, 18–21.

Kingdom, although this is not certain, D refers to the customs of the Northern Kingdom and P comes from the priests of the Temple of Jerusalem.

Though accepting J, E, D and P as having been composed approximately between the end of the tenth and the fifth century, however, we do not admit that they originated then. As has been stated already, they existed long before this time. They started from much older oral or written traditions, and gradually grew and developed into the form in which we now have them. As a matter of fact J and E are parallel traditions and give essentially the same history: they have a common origin. They presuppose political and social circumstances and a geographical and historical frame which is that of the time in which the facts they relate, happened.¹² Their common origin goes back to the time of the formation of the people of Israel.

The same can be said, with reservations however, about the legislative sections. We find in all of them the same juridical principles, the prescriptions of the same religion, the rules of the same cult, adapted of course to the different circumstances of the different periods, but throughout it is the same civil and religious law of the people. Their first origin goes back to the time of the formation of the people. Because of their very nature, the development of the laws is, of course, much greater, yet these sections contain old elements. In this matter also, oriental texts help in proving the antiquity of some parts. Thus the civil law of the Code of the Covenant Exodus xxi—xxiii bears a striking resemblance to the Babylonian laws, promulgated long before the Exodus, and to the Assyrian laws promulgated shortly after the Exodus.

The conclusion is that the essential contents of the Pentateuch, the substance of its traditions, and the kernel of its laws go back to the time of the formation of the Chosen People, and it is precisely at this time that Moses is the central figure. It was he who guided them during the time of the oppression in Egypt, he who formed these semi-nomads into an organized people during the wandering in the desert, he who established the religion and gave the first laws. He was their great leader in things religious and political at the time of their formation. The old traditions before his time and the events in which he played such an important part grew into the national epic, having him as the great historical figure, through whom God had given to Israel its religion and laws. It was the religion of Moses which determined their faith and it was the law of Moses which ruled their life. Later adaptations could not be made unless they preserved the same spirit and thus were covered by his authority.

It is in this way that Fr de Vaux explains the external evidence of the tradition. He says that it is this historical function of Moses which

¹² See the articles referred to in note 5.

the tradition expresses by connecting the name of Moses with the Pentateuch, and this tradition stands firm. The early tradition, however, is much less explicit when it refers to the redaction of the Pentateuch. The words 'Moses wrote' are to be taken in a general sense and never refer to the whole Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch itself these words are applied to some particular passages and there is no reason to doubt a certain literary activity on the part of Moses. Never, however, shall we be able to determine how great this first edition was, nor what texts came from his hand. The tradition attributing the whole of the Pentateuch to Moses is fundamentally correct: the first origin of the traditions composing the Pentateuch is Mosaic. These traditions grew and developed in different circles and different places, but throughout that growth they maintained the same spirit, the same Mosaic character.

Fr de Vaux agrees that, in the literary analysis, much is still hypothetical. But we need this analysis to make it possible to put a text in its own tradition and see it against its own background, conditions necessary for the proper understanding of a text.

Thus we have seen the essential lines of Fr de Vaux's solution. He utilized the scientific works of many scholars of the past and present, but he did it in a personal way. He drew his arguments from archæology and from the study of the civilizations around Israel. He took into account the witness of tradition. But for a great part the solution is based on the contents and phenomena of the texts themselves. In this way he came to a solution which certainly has the advantage of taking into account both the sound results of literary criticism and the external evidence of the early and recent tradition. As a result of historical circumstances, this solution may at first surprise readers by its novelty. Only those familiar with the texts of the books and the difficulties they create are able to rate the proposed solution at its true value. I would invite those who are not so familiar to read with care, the author's translation, paying attention to the numerous footnotes, and I am sure that it will bring them to a right appreciation of the proposed solution.

W. M. VALK, S.C.J.

St Joseph's College, Malpas (Cheshire).

28th May 1952.

‘NOT TO SWEAR AT ALL’

MATTHEW V, 34

IT is recorded in the Sermon on the Mount: ‘You have heard that it was said to them of old, “Thou shalt not forswear thyself”, but “Thou shalt perform thy oaths to the Lord”; but I say to you not to swear at all, neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God, nor by the earth for it is his footstool, nor by Jerusalem for it is the city of the great king; neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be “Yea, yea; no, no”. And that which is over and above these is of evil’ Matt. v, 33—37. ‘I say to you not to swear at all.’ In form this is an unqualified prohibition; but does our Lord in fact forbid all taking of oaths? In the first place, He does not say that a strengthening of a simple affirmation or denial by an oath is evil—but is ‘of evil,’ that is springs from evil. That is to say that the use of oaths is due to man’s fallen nature. If men were entirely innocent and always spoke the truth, there would be no need of oaths. Men would always believe each other. It is because we are prone to evil that when there might be a temptation to lie concerning some important matter, an oath is used that its sanctity and the wickedness of its violation may help to secure the utterance of the truth. In the second place, Scripture records oaths taken by God Himself: ‘God making promise to Abraham, because He had no one greater by whom he might swear, swore by himself’, Heb. vi, 13, and again ‘But this with an oath, by him that said unto him “The Lord hath sworn and he will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever”’, Heb. vii, 21 quoting Ps. 109: 4. The Apostles, who knew our Lord’s teaching, had no scruple in having recourse to an oath when the occasion required it: ‘What I write to you, behold, before God, I lie not’, Gal. i, 20. And again, ‘I call God to witness upon my soul that to spare you I came not any more to Corinth’, II Cor. i, 23. And see further I Cor. xv, 31, Rom. i, 9, Phil. i, 8. These instances suffice to show that our Lord did not prohibit oaths altogether in spite of the apparently absolute form of the words.

How then are His words to be explained? Here we are helped by recalling the audience our Lord was addressing and the rabbinical teaching on the validity of oaths. In Deut. vi, 13, it is laid down that ‘Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God and serve him only, and thou shalt swear by his name’. From this the Rabbis deduced that only those oaths were of binding force in which the name of God is invoked or some equivalent such as ‘the Merciful One’. This is explicitly laid down in the Mishnah and the Talmud (*Shebu’oth* IV, 13; Babylonian Talmud *ibid.* 35a—b). *As a corollary of this it is recognized in the same passages that oaths by heaven and earth are not binding.* To such teaching our

Lord opposes the words of Scripture: 'Heaven is my throne and the earth my footstool', Is. lxvi, 1, and the name given to Jerusalem in Ps. 47, 3 'the city of the great king'. The argument that the Rabbis used of oaths by heaven, earth, and Jerusalem would, if valid, apply also to oaths by one's head, and we may deduce from our Lord's words that such oaths were in use by his contemporaries but considered to be of no binding force. To this He replies in effect that the reasoning is invalid, because the head is a creature of God's and to God alone belongs full dominion over it.

The sense of the passage may, therefore, be paraphrased as follows. You have heard that it was said to them of old 'Thou shalt not perjure thyself, but shalt pay thy oaths to God'. You acknowledge that an oath taken by the name of God is binding, and that if you do not intend to keep it, you must not take such an oath. But I say to you that this is true not only of oaths taken by the name of God, but also of oaths by any creature precisely because all are God's creatures, and all such oaths are therefore equivalent to oaths by God. Hence you can perjure yourselves by any oath, and therefore, if you do not intend to abide by your oath, you must not swear either by God or by any creature at all. To this is added a precept to be satisfied with a simple affirmation or denial except in cases where the corroboration of an oath is required by the circumstances—a qualification implicit in the whole context.

The correctness of this interpretation may be confirmed by the consideration that our Lord said in so many words 'Do not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil', Matt. v, 17. Now the liceity of oaths had express divine sanction in the Law, and our Lord does not 'destroy' by contradicting the divine commandment to swear by the name of God, but 'fulfils' or perfects it by teaching that all oaths are binding as being in substance equivalent to oaths taken in the name of God.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

How are the two apparently contradictory sayings of our Lord to be reconciled: 'He that is not with me is against me' (Matt. xii, 30; Luke xi, 23). 'He that is not against you is for you' (Mark ix, 39; Luke ix, 23). And which of these should be applied to co-operation with non-Catholics in Christian Action?

Both these sayings are connected by the evangelists with accounts of exorcisms, but their contexts are different, and it is from a study of these contexts that the apparent contradiction is resolved. In the first case, our Lord has been accused of casting out a devil by the power of Beelzeboul. He shows that such a charge is ridiculous. In the first place for Satan to fight against himself is sheer suicide; secondly Christ has only done what others have done, and these have been held in honour; thirdly his action has shown Him to be more powerful than the devil, and only good can triumph over evil. If then, their accusation is so obviously false, then malice can be the only reason for their making it. In the second case, John complains that a certain exorcist was casting out devils by the use of Christ's name, although he was not one of Christ's disciples. They have gone so far as to take action against him. But why? If he uses the name of Christ then he cannot be one of those who abuse Christ. True, he is not one of their company; but this is through no malice, and if he bears no malice, then he is not on the side of the enemy. In the struggle between good and evil, neutrality is impossible; all those therefore who bear no malice towards Christ are, to that extent, refusing to co-operate with the enemy of Christ. The sayings might be thus paraphrased: 'He that is not with me, because he deliberately refuses my invitation to follow me, is my enemy', and 'He who bears no malice towards you, who does not refuse to join you for any evil motives, is on your side'. If it were considered desirable to apply either of these sayings to co-operation with non-Catholics in Christian Action, the second would be chosen, since it refers to those whose differences do not arise from ill-will, and who reverence the name of Christ, even though they are not counted among the company of disciples He has gathered together.

T. WORDEN.

'A little while, and now you shall not see me: and again a little while, and you shall see me: because I go to the Father' (John xvi, 16). The Vulgate has 'videbitis' in both places for the words rendered in English by 'shall see', although the Greek Testament uses two different words. In the first place it uses θεωρεῖτε and in the second ὀψεσθε. Is there some shade of meaning which the Evangelist intended to convey by the use of two different words, which has become lost in translation?

These words of our Lord refer to His departure by death and to His return by His resurrection. The last phrase 'because I go to the

Father' is not read in the better manuscripts, and is an insertion from verse 17. The long association which the apostles have had with Christ is soon to be ended. It will, however, be followed by the apparitions after the resurrection, which will turn their sorrow into joy. Judging from the context, one would be inclined to think that the two verbs have been chosen to express the difference between that continuous beholding which the disciples have enjoyed throughout the public ministry, and the brief apparitions they will be granted after the resurrection. It is possibly with the intention of expressing this distinction that the Westminster Version translates the verse: 'A little while and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me'. But this difference of meaning is decided entirely from the context and is not contained in the use of the two verbs. θεωρεω is certainly used in the sense of 'to behold, view attentively' even 'to enjoy the presence of someone' cf. Acts xx, 38. But ὁραω too, is used of a long contemplation: e.g., in Matt. v, 8; Heb. xii, 14; and Apoc. xxii, 4 it is used of the vision of God which is the reward of the just. Why then are the two different verbs used? The reason seems to lie simply in the New Testament usage: ὁρῶμαι is the regular future tense of the verb 'to see', whereas the future of θεωρεω was not used. It is found once only: in John vii, 3, and even in this case, there is a variant reading (though with less support) of the aorist subjunctive.

T. WORDEN.

In an old (1887) edition of the Missale Romanum the verses of the Epistles and Gospels are not given by numbers as in modern editions by but single letters, thus John xvi b. What was this system, when did it originate and when did it end?

The books of the Bible were first divided into chapters by Cardinal Stephen Langton (d. 1228). A further step was taken soon afterwards towards facilitating reference when the first concordance to the Vulgate was compiled by Cardinal Hugh of Saint-Cher c. 1240. He sub-divided the chapters into seven parts which he noted in the margin by using the letters a, b, c, d, e, f, g. This system of sub-division was used for about three hundred years, until the verses were first numbered as they are to-day, in a Greek and Latin edition of the New Testament edited by Robert Estienne in 1555. This was obviously a more convenient method of reference and it soon replaced the former system, which, however, is still preserved in certain editions of the Missal and Breviary.

THE ORIGINALITY OF ST MATTHEW

A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis, by B. C. Butler, Abbot of Downside. Cambridge at the University Press, 1951; vii and 179 pages, 18s. net.

THERE will scarcely be one scholar, at all abreast of the literary problem of the Synoptic Gospels, who is not keenly interested in the title of Abbot Butler's book: *The Originality of St Matthew*. I suppose the first question to present itself to his mind is, which Matthew does the author mean, the Aramaic or the Greek Matthew, and if the latter, does he mean our Greek Matthew or a former translation like one of those Papias refers to?¹ A glance at the first page of the first chapter leads one to think that he will award the priority to our Greek Matthew. Previously, however, the preface has already warned us of the prominent part the sub-title of the book is to play. As a matter of fact, whoever wants to prove that the Gospel of St Matthew ranked first in the history of the literary development of the Synoptic Gospels, whether he has in mind the Aramaic or a Greek edition of that Gospel, will have to make his stand against the Two-Document hypothesis,² which is still predominant in many scholarly circles. Now one might do so in several ways, more or less directly. Abbot Butler chooses the direct way, I should say the extremely direct way: 'If', as he says himself, 'the outcome of the investigation may be said to contradict the conclusions of the older critics, it will I hope be agreed that this has been the result of a faithful application of their methods' (p. v). This certainly forms the strongest side of the book.

In the first four chapters the 'conjectural source' Q is tested for agreement of Matthew and Luke in non-Markan material, the arguments alleged for Q are criticized and a great number of passages of the Gospels examined. Of course not every time is the outcome conclusive, but again and again Q is shown to be tending to become more than a simple source of sayings, and continually assuming the features of a complete Gospel, in fact of Matthew (Abbot Butler here means our Matthew, but I am of opinion it would be more accurate to say, of a Gospel very much like our Matthew).

In the second part of his book (chapters v to xi) the Abbot discusses the other pillar of the Two-Document hypothesis, namely the priority of St Mark's Gospel. Leading off with a severe criticism of what he calls 'the Lachmann fallacy',³ he examines further the relation between

¹ For the text of Papias see Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. III, cap. 39 (P.G., XX, 300).

² The theory holds, 'that our First and Third Gospels depend on the Second Gospel and on a conjectural source of which Q has become the usual designation' (p. v).

³ Lachmann held the view that the three Synoptic Gospels are dependent on one common source, oral or written. His followers, however, eliminated the possibility of an oral source, identified the common written source of Matthew and Luke with Mark, but did not take into account this change of situation in their conclusions, and so they introduced the 'fallacy'.

the five great discourses of Matthew and their Marcan parallel-texts and in the next chapter the opinion of Streeter and Burney about Mark's use of Q. 'Miscellaneous passages', 'Doublets in Matthew', 'Inclusio, Formulae and Aramaisms' are the other points of investigation. He comes to the conclusion that Mark is not the first of the Synoptic Gospels, but is dependent on Matthew, and here again our Matthew is meant. According to this conclusion the author builds up in the last chapter his own theory on the origin of St Mark's Gospel.

In both parts of the book several of the points brought to the fore are quite striking and the whole set of stronger and less clinching arguments taken together is conclusive as far as the critique of the Two-Document hypothesis is concerned. I do not, however, agree with the author's other conclusion, namely that our Matthew was known and used by St Mark as well as by St Luke.⁴

There is an old adage, *bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu* which means, in our case, that if one can allege some texts where Q turns out to be something more than a simple collection of sayings and discourses, and some others where Mark is dependent on an edition of Matthew, the Two-Document hypothesis has been proved wrong; to prove, however, that our Matthew was written before St Mark and St Luke wrote their Gospels and was used by them requires an exhaustive elucidation not only of the agreements but also of the divergences between the Synoptic Gospels. And here the Abbot fails, for there are some questions, the solution of which appears necessary to prove this point, which do not even come up for discussion in his book; and in the cases in which he accepts the originality of our Matthew as at least more probable, his arguments are not convincing. In this review of course I cannot catalogue all the problems he leaves without a solution nor discuss in detail the arguments he gives. For the sake of brevity I shall mainly confine myself to one point which I consider a key-point since it affects the author's reasoning throughout the entire book. This is the fundamental principle of critical method he introduces. He says on page 1: *sources and their relations are not to be multiplied unnecessarily*. The principle may be correct in itself, but the correctness of its application depends for the most part on the way 'unnecessarily' is understood. Now he takes it very strictly, in my opinion—perhaps on account of his reaction to the Two-Document hypothesis—too strictly; for example, when he says; 'A hypothesis which introduces a conjectural document and multiplies, instead of reducing, literary relationships is suspect a

⁴ According to the Two-Document hypothesis St Mark's Gospel is absolutely first of the written Gospels, which means it had been written before the origin of Matthew, whatsoever form of this Gospel is meant. Hence distinguishing between the Aramaic Matthew and its Greek version(s) one can deny that *absolute* priority of Mark and still assume that Mark was written before *our* Matthew, which may or may not be dependent on it.

priori' (p. 60). Documentary criticism is a matter of historical research, that is research into the facts as they happened in reality. The investigator does not invent the facts, but tries to discover them by means of the data supplied by internal and external evidence. The 'onus probandi' lies on the protagonists of each and every theory and not only upon the supporters of a more complicated suggestion (p. 158) or 'on the theory that substitutes a complicated for a simple scheme of literary relationships' (p. 159); and the correctness of a proposed solution depends on the accuracy of the appraisal of all the data. None of the data may be neglected and no one has the right to set a limit to a solution beforehand. Every statement *a priori* is inadmissible. One must await a tested result. If the data are simple, they will probably lead to a solution showing simple facts; if the data are complicated, they will probably lead to a solution showing complicated facts. Even a supposition beforehand is dangerous, since, as the Abbot himself says: 'It is important to realize that there is nothing so improbable as the actual' (p. 170).

I think it is due to his preference for a simple solution that he denies the Aramaic Matthew any influence in the proper Synoptic problem, whereas according to our author's reconstruction of the facts, St Matthew had already edited the authentic version of his Gospel that is still in our possession, before St Mark and St Luke took pen in hand, and they used this Greek Matthew as St Peter did for his 'instructions' (p. 165ff.). The former translations Papias speaks about would have been oral translations made 'impromptu and as occasion dictates' (p. 166). This seems to me a rather improbable explanation of Papias' text. It is the more amazing because the Abbot himself states more than once that dependence on an Aramaic source would square quite well with the data in St Luke's Gospel (p. 41, 57, 59). As for St Mark, the statement about Matt. xix, 16-30—Mark x, 17-31 is very interesting: 'If it were not for the complication introduced into the general problem of Matthew's relations with Mark, one would in this case be tempted to suppose that one or other had misunderstood an Aramaic record of the words exchanged on the occasion in question' (p. 133). Would not the former translations mentioned by Papias here meet the demands of the data more satisfactorily?

He who is aware of the mind of the author will not wonder that he did not see any other possibility than such alternatives as the following: 'Either then our Lord preached a sermon on this theme, which Matthew has expanded, 'Judaized' (i.e., set back into a Jewish thought-world and made relevant to Palestinian controversies), and so transformed into a quasi-original Christian manifesto; or St Luke has transformed a sermon of the latter type into a shorter one on a more generalized theme' (p. 46f.); 'Did St Mark excerpt from Matthew, or did St Matthew embody the Marcan story in a greater whole?' (p. 72); 'Has Matthew deliberately

"archaized" his list by the arrangement in pairs, or has Mark destroyed Matthew's delicate indication of the original practice?" (p. 105).

There is still one statement I would refer to; 'Since it cannot be supposed that Matthew used Luke . . .' (p. 41). It is by no means my intention to prove that Matthew depends on Luke, but I wonder, whether the datum that Matthew uses once only some characteristic Lucan words, as for example: tetrarch (Matt. xiv, 1, but in xiv, 6, 'the king'; Luke iii, 19, ix, 7 and Acts xiii, 1; cf. the verb in Luke iii, 1; not in Mark or John); lawyer (Matt. xxii, 35; Luke 6 times; not in Mark or John) and the orthographical form of Jerusalem in Matt. xxiii, 37 (Luke 26 times; Acts 36 times; not in Mark or John)⁵ does not require further investigation? It seems to me at least unjustifiable to reject *a priori* the possibility that the final editor of our Matthew used the parallel-texts of Luke for the revision of his version and was sometimes influenced by them.

Several times Abbot Butler appeals to Matthew's superiority in the matter of rhythm, style, the context of individual passages, as well as the mutual arrangement and connection of several passages. The author admits: '. . . it is . . . quite true that we need not suppose that Mark is dependent on a source just because he 'spoils' 'the simplicity, the presumably primitive form, of one of his own stories' (p. 127). I believe we need, in addition to positive proofs of dependence of one on the other, conclusive arguments, or at least very strong extenuating circumstances before assuming that the better text is the original one, which has been spoiled by the dependent author, for it is more probable that the dependent author has smoothed away the shortcomings of his source than the opposite. On this account the author's reasoning is not convincing. Is Matt. x, 17-22 really better in its context (the instruction before the first mission of the Apostles; cf. Matt. x, 5f.) than Mark xiii, 9-13? (for Mark xiii, 9 cp. Acts ix, 2, xxii, 30; II Cor. xi, 24) (p. 80). Would Mark have changed the singular 'parable' of Matt. xxi, 33 into plural (Mark xii, 1), because he noticed Matthew had in fact more parables, although he had in mind to borrow only one? (p. 101). Why does Matthew have (according to the Greek) in xviii, 6 'it is expedient' as in v, 29f., but in xviii, 8f. 'it is better' as Mark in ix, 42, 43, 45, 47, if Matt. xviii, 8f. is a cross-reference of Matt. v, 29f.? (p. 298f.). If Abbot Butler exonerates Matthew from patchwork, does he think it is at all possible that the other Synoptists patched together their texts, as for example he suggests has been done by Luke in xi, 37-xii, 1 dependent on Matthew xxiii, 25f., 23, 6f., 27, 4, 29-31, 34-6, 13 (for Luke xii, 1 see Matt. xvi 6, 12; cp. Mark viii, 15) (p. 53); and in xii, 2-12 dependent on Matt. x, 26-33, xii, 32, x, 19f. (p. 54); by Mark in xiii, 33-7 dependent

⁵ For more examples cf. Hawkins' list of 'Words and phrases characteristic of St Luke's Gospel'; (John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, Oxford, 1919, 2, pp. 35-51).

on Matthew xxv, 13, 14, 15b, 16, xxiv, 45, 42f., xxv, 6, xxiv, 50 (cf. xxv, 6, 5), xxv, 32 (p. 82ff.), and in iv, 21-5 dependent on Matt. v, 15, x, 26, xiii, 9, vii, 2, vi, 33, xiii, 12 (p. 89)? Is it not strange that Luke has so often used either both parts of the Matthaean doublets or just the other part that he found in the Matthaean context he was actually following?

Finally I will emphasize that these remarks do not detract anything from my estimation of the author's decisive refutation of the Two-Document hypothesis. And this has a not merely negative value, since it remains true that a distinction between Q and the Matthaean tradition⁶ is baseless and that Mark turns out to have known the Matthaean tradition. Abbot Butler substitutes, however, our Matthew for the Matthaean tradition and by so doing he tries to prove too much, which causes serious damage to his own argument.

Concerning Matthew's doublets he says: '... he (Matthew) is, in fact, employing, in some of them, a device for cross-reference, the custom of using footnotes not being found in antiquity' (p. 138). I believe that if the author of our Greek Matthew had proceeded in accordance with present-day custom, we should have read on the front page of his book: 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ, adapted from Matthew's Aramaic text by N N', and probably even, 'second (or third) revised (and enlarged?) edition'.

ANT. J. VAN DER VOORT, S.C.J.

St Joseph's College, Malpas (Cheshire).
23rd May 1952.

BOOK REVIEWS

Guide Biblique by Dom Paul Passelecq. Pp. 75. *La Lecture Chrétienne de le Bible*. Third edition by Dom Celestin Charlier. Pp. xv, 348. (Editions de Maredsous, 1950). Prices not stated.

If only we had more books like this in English! We may bewail Catholic apathy to the Bible in England, and try to encourage the faithful to read the Bible more, but the fact is that they are going to remain largely apathetic unless we can supply them with a good and reliable guide who can show them the way through what must be, for a stranger, very bewildering country without bewildering them further, who can point out the sights, and who can above all speak their own idiom. The *Guide Biblique* is just this, with its three-page synopsis of Hebrew history, its short but clear analysis of the contents and the literary forms of the

⁶ By Matthaean tradition I understand some stage in the literary process from the Aramaic Matthew to our Greek Matthew.

Bible, and its remarkably excellent introduction to each of its books. The beginner will be especially grateful for being told what is going to distract him and what he might therefore well miss out while he is making this preliminary acquaintance with the Bible. The *Guide Biblique* has already appeared as the introduction to the smaller edition of the Maredsous Bible. Its publication as a separate booklet will surely help it to reach that wider public which it deserves.

La Lecture Chrétienne is the guide for the man who is not content with a mere preliminary acquaintance of the Bible. There are plenty of Introductions which offer us a technical approach to the Bible, but nobody will deny that they are too often unattractive because they stop short of the one thing in an Introduction which matters—leading the reader *into* the Bible to show him where the spiritual nourishment is to be found. There are also a number of Introductions which offer a so-called spiritual approach, and nobody will deny that they are too often unscientific and merely subjective, and at times even painfully sentimental. It is a relief to find an Introduction which has integrated very real spirituality with equally real scholarship. Dom Charlier tells his reader all that he needs to know about Canonicity, Inspiration, Inerrancy, Texts and Versions, Principles of Interpretation, Historical and Geographical Background, and so on. But he will take him a lot further than these merely preliminary questions, really introduce him into the Bible, and make him appreciate, in all its delicate details, the amazing harmony of God's plan which it contains and which was the only reason for its writing. It is books like these that are urgently needed today, when our apologetic and negative attitude to the Bible is threatening to come full circle and strangle the thing that we have been trying to defend.

The Encyclical 'Humani Generis' with a Commentary by A. C. Cotter, S.J.
Pp. xi, 100 (Weston College Press, U.S.A., 1951) 1 Dollar.

This recent encyclical is a document of far-reaching importance, for while it plainly announces its purpose as the condemnation of false trends in modern teaching, there is nothing merely negative in its approach; it is the positive doctrine of the Church which is constantly being put forward as a guide to Catholic scholars in their work. The numerous commentaries which have appeared since its publication give witness to the interest it has aroused among Catholics. In this work Fr Cotter tries to provide a stimulus to a more intense study of the document by giving us not only the Latin text and a translation, but also a commentary which makes more explicit some of the conclusions to be drawn from the closely-packed sentences of the encyclical. He therefore gives the reader perhaps a fairer impression of the whole than might be given by the periodicals with their detailed analyses of individual

aspects only. In this clear and concise commentary lies the book's chief value. The translation itself is adequate. While it is not without its own refreshing colloquialisms, it lacks the polish of the Knox version (C.T.S., 1950) and is at times perhaps too slavish to the Latin ('hermeneutical principles and norms', 'a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma and the tenets of the dissidents'). This is all the less necessary when the Latin text is on the opposite page and can easily be referred to, although it has its advantages where such technical terms as 'Magisterium', 'analogy of faith', 'rational exegesis' are concerned, formulas which the Knox tends to disguise and lose. This faithfulness to the Latin makes it all the more difficult to see how 'nequaquam appareat quomodo' came to be translated into 'it is unintelligible how', in the important section on polygenism. In the midst of such technical and precise terminology, is it altogether necessary to interpret this loose phrase as 'polygenism is definitely banned' (p. 97), when most other commentators agree that the door to further discussion has not been finally locked?

H. J. RICHARDS.

Geografía Bíblica (El País de Jesús) por Andrés Fernández Truyols, S.J. Pp. xviii, 151 (Barcelona, Editorial Vilamala, 1951). Price not indicated.

This introduction to the geography of Palestine comes from the pen of a former Rector of the Biblical Institute at Rome already known from his more erudite work on this subject. It was in 1936 that he published his *Problemas de Topografía Palestinense* and we may look forward to the appearance of a larger and more erudite treatment for which he has long been collecting materials. In the meantime students have here in a readable and handy form a general survey of the whole subject. A prolonged residence in the Holy Land has enabled him to write with the knowledge and authority acquired by a personal visit to practically every site described. Father Fernandez's method is not that of purely geographical exposition. He has followed the more helpful method of weaving into his narrative historical reminiscences derived from the Bible.

The book is divided into three main sections, on the physical geography, the political geography, and what the respective heading designates as historic-topographical geography. The section on the climate contains interesting and useful information with exact statistics on temperature, rainfall, and snow which it would not be easy to find elsewhere. For instance, one table gives the maximum and minimum temperature for each month of 1949 as recorded in six different cities. This well illustrates the very diverse climates experienced in so small a country. The work is well illustrated with photographs, topographical plans, and maps.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

Biblical Authority for To-day. A World Council of Churches symposium on 'The Bible Authority for the Churches' social and political message to-day': edited by Alan Richardson, D.D., Canon of Durham, and W. Schweitzer, D.Theol., Secretary in the Study Department, World Council of Churches, Geneva. (S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1951). 18s. net.

Apart from the foreword and preface, this book consists of four main parts: (1) 'The Authority of the Bible: fundamental considerations': (2) 'Biblical Theology and Ethics to-day: a survey of the world position': (3) 'Principles of Interpretation': (4) 'Some Specific Applications'. It will be observed that the main title says nothing about 'the Churches' social and political message to-day', which is perhaps as well for 'specific applications' are not much in evidence; I have not noticed any mention of communism, for example, and the word is not in the index. But there is a good deal about authority. 'In the first part', as is remarked in the jacket, 'the contributors examine the nature of the authority of the Bible in their particular denominations'. The first paper is by a Greek Orthodox professor of Theology at Athens and, as might be expected, comes nearest to the Catholic view. This is followed by Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, Reformed, Lutheran and Anglican papers, this last one by Canon Richardson, one of the editors. It is a striking paper, but not altogether free from mistakes. 'For the Anglican divines', he writes, 'tradition is not a separate authority to be set alongside the Bible, as it was for post-Tridentine Romanism. They would have agreed with Aquinas that nothing was to be received as necessary to salvation which could not be proved by 'most certain warrants of Holy Scripture' (p. 118).

It depends what one means by 'a separate authority to be set alongside the Bible'. The sixth of the thirty-nine Articles lays it down that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation'. Thereupon the article proceeds to enumerate its defective canon of the Old Testament (incidentally misquoting St Jerome on the subject), and ends by saying, 'All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical', a sentence which clearly contains in itself an appeal to tradition, for evidently neither New Testament nor Old can prove *itself* to be canonical, as Protestants would desire. The Bible, that is to say can have no 'separate authority' of its own apart from tradition, which defines and determines it—and, it may be added, authoritatively interprets it. That has always been clear in the Catholic Church, and not merely to 'post-Tridentine Romanism'.

Nor does Aquinas require 'most certain warrants of Holy Scripture'

before accepting any doctrine, though he (mistakenly) does require some warrant. On this point I venture to refer to my article on the subject in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for April, 1946.

However, this is not a controversial book, but on the contrary courteously regrets the absence of a 'Roman Catholic contribution', and recognizes the marked new emphasis on biblical study in our communion to-day (p. 11). But 'Roman Catholics' cannot recognize the collection of denominations here represented as 'the œcumenical Church' or as 'his (Christ's) community' (p. 284), nor covet a share in their deliberations. Suffice it therefore to say that one would like to see some more hard thinking upon 'biblical authority'.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

History of Mediaeval Philosophy by Maurice de Wulf. Translated by Ernest C. Messenger. Vol. I. Pp. xviii, 317 (Nelson and Sons) 21s.

In 1934 Maurice de Wulf published the first volume of his history in its sixth edition. Two years later came the second, but it was not until 1947, a few weeks before the author's death, that the third and last volume appeared. This new edition changed and improved the previous one so considerably that the English translation of the latter became obsolete. English readers were grateful, therefore, when the translator, the late Dr Messenger made no delay in giving them the new edition. His translation of the first two volumes followed quickly upon the French in 1935 and 1938; but unfortunately it was completely destroyed during the war. The volume under review is the first of a re-edition, and this time a translation of the third volume will complete the work.

The history of de Wulf has become a standard one; it is too well known for any detailed criticism to be in place here. Its chief value is as a text-book and reference-work; lacking the attractive presentation of Gilson's survey, it is more complete in its information and bibliographies. The translation is both competent and graceful, but a good sprinkling of misprints and five slight mistranslations show that the proofs were not carefully corrected.

A most puzzling point is the definite statement in the translator's introduction that 'the bibliographies have been brought down to the end of 1947'. They have not; there are but two additions. This is most damaging to the usefulness of the work. Perhaps it is intended that the third volume should contain an appendix listing the more recent publications.

The translator has left aside the sparing method of the original, which gave but one index for the set, and is providing each volume with its own. He has also added a biographical note on the author.

C. DAVIS.

